

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of this application and the indication that claims 6 and 10 contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action tentatively rejected claims 1, 3, 5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by USPN 5,075,824 to Tan. Claims 2 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over USPN 5,075,824 to Tan in view of USPN Patent 6,508,562 B2 to Venkatram et al. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over USPN 5,075,824 to Tan in view of USPN 2,909,7240 to Onksen et al. or US 2003/0095398 A1 to Parker et al. Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over USPN 5,075,824 to Tan in view of USPN 4,445,164 to Giles, III, et al.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 and canceled claim 6. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Discussion of rejection under §35 U.S.C. 102 (b)

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by USPN 5,075,824 to Tan. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections made by the Examiner for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A lighting apparatus for an electronic device, comprising:
a hollow module having an inner reflective surface and an opening;
a light source disposed in the hollow module;
a lens disposed in the opening, having an incident surface and a display surface, the incident surface faced inside the hollow module, the lens located on the electronic device;
wherein light rays emitted from the light source are reflected by the inner surface and transmitted into the incident surface then exit the lens through the display surface.

In contrast to this claimed subject matter, USPN 5,075,824 (to Tan) appears to disclose an LCD/light wedge module with an LCD unit engaged therein to prevent hot spots. Referring to col. 2, lines 20-22, as disclosed in Tan, “a light wedge 10 constructed of light conducting material is formed with a substantially rectangular planar viewing surface 12”. That is, the planar viewing surface 12 in Tan’s patent is formed on the light wedge 10, and therefore it cannot be properly equated to the lens 22 of the claimed invention.

With respect to amended claim 1 of the present application, the lighting apparatus for an electronic device comprises a hollow module having an opening and a lens disposed in the opening. However, Tan fails to disclose or teach such a lens disposed in the opening, as expressly claimed in claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 defines over the cited art.

Insofar as the claims 2-5 and 7-11 depend from claim 1, these claims also define over the cited art.

Discussion of rejection under §35 U.S.C. 103 (a)

Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,075,824 to Tan in view of USPN Patent 6,508,562 B2 to Venkatram et al. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,075,824 to Tan in view of USPN 2,909,7240 to Onksen et al. or US 2003/0095398 A1 to Parker et al. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,075,824 to Tan in view of USPN 4,445,164 to Giles, III, et al.

The Examiner admitted that Tan, Venkatram, Onksen and Giles fail to teach or disclose a lens disposed in the opening with the limitations of original claim 6, and that this claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Since claim 6 is cancelled, and claim 1 is amended

including all of the limitations of original claims 1 and 6, amended claim 1 clearly defines over the cited art.

Insofar as the claims 2-5, 7-11 depend from claim 1, these claims define over the art as well.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500